UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/790,169	03/01/2004	Adrian C. Moga	BEA920030024US1	1020

49474   7590   03/27/2009
LAW OFFICES OF MICHAEL DRYJA (San Jose)
1474 N COOPER RD #105-248
GILBERT, AZ 85233

EXAMINER
LI, ZHUO H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2185	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
03/27/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

PTOL-90A (Rev. 04/07)

1.   Applicant's arguments filed 3/15/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to applicant's argument for claims 9-11 and 15 that Irie does not anticipate the claimed invention because Irie selectively broadcasts – a coherent processing request – is not a cache miss, examiner disagreed. It is noted that the claimed language merely define "logic within each node to determine whether a cache miss relating to a memory unit should be transmitted only to a sub-plurality of nodes lesser in number than the plurality of nodes but greater than one, based on a criteria" such that the inventive concept is directed to transmit *a cache miss related to a memory unit, i.e., cache miss information,* to a sub-plurality of nodes. Note Irie clearly teaches to transmit a coherent processing request, which is considered as cache miss information, to a sub-plurality of nodes. As admitted by applicant, Irie teaches that the coherent processing request is generated in response to cache miss (see applicant's response to final Office action, pages 10-11) such that the coherent processing request can provided cache miss information to the sub-plurality of nodes because the coherent processing request is generated when cache miss is occurred. Although it may be true that the function of cache miss is different from the function of coherent process request as argued, the claimed language fails to specifically direct to the function of cache miss. In fact, the claimed invention is direct to transmit cache miss information to the sub-plurality of node. Note Irie teaches the same inventive concept. Thus, Irie anticipates the claimed invention.

Claims 12-14 and 16 have been rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irie in view of Steely (2005/0160430). Claims 12-14 are dependent claims depending from claim 9, and therefore are rejected because claim 9 is rejected, as discussed above. Claim 16 is an

independent claim, and includes the same limitations that have been discussed above in relation

to independent claims 9 and 15. Therefore, claim 16 is rejected under Irie in view of Steely for at

least substantially the same reasons that claims 9 and 15 are rejected Irie alone, as has been

discussed above.

/Tuan V. Thai/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2185